

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/936,500

Applicant(s)

WOLGE, HAKAN

Examiner

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2171

All Participants:

(1) Susan Y Chen.

(2) William N. Hughet.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 July 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S. Code 112 rejections.

Claims discussed:

1-15

Prior art documents discussed:

AAPA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The arguments filed on 04/29/2004 did not resolve the 35 USC 112 rejections on record. The examiner requests that applicant to specifically points out the followings:

1) the associations between the sections of page 8, lines 30-31, page 16, lines 14-18 and the table 17 for linking to the claimed partition mechanism; 2) the definition of claimed binary table and it's relation to the connecting tables; 3) what are the claimed various variables under the USC 112, second paragraph rejection on record, what is the novelty of the instant invention?

However, during the interview, applicant's attorney fails to response to the examiner's questions, he merely replies that he will call back to resolve the problem, but until now, no reponse was received from the attorney. As such, the examiner maintains the rejections on record.